

REMARKS

By this paper, claims 62, 68 and 69 have been amended and claims 43, 45, 56, 58, 61 and 64-67 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-32, 62, 68 and 69 are pending. Claims 33-61, 63-67, and 70-71 have been canceled. Claims 1-32 have been allowed.

Disclaimers Relating to Claim Interpretation and Prosecution History Estoppel

Claims 43, 45, 56, 58, 61 and 64-67 have been canceled, notwithstanding the belief that these claims were allowable. Claims 62, 68 and 69 have been amended solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process, and the amendments were not necessary for patentability.

The claims of this application are intended to stand on their own and are not to be read in light of the prosecution history of any related or unrelated patent or patent application. Furthermore, no arguments in any prosecution history relate to any claim in this application, except for arguments specifically directed to the claim.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 62, 68 and 69 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Per the Examiner's recommendation, claim 62 has been amended to be independent and to incorporate the limitations of claim 61, which has been canceled. Claims 68 and 69 have been amended to be independent and to include all of the limitations of claim 67, which has been canceled. Therefore, the objection has been overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 43, 45, 56 and 58 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious from Brickley (USP 5,902,552) in view of either Bigelow (USP 6,221,314) or Hollander (USP 5,334,347). Claims 43, 45, 56 and 58 have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 61 and 64-67 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious from Brickley in view of Hollander and Kurtz et al. (USP 5,660,719). Claims 61 and 64-67 have been canceled.

Conclusion

It is submitted, however, that the independent and dependent claims include other significant and substantial recitations which are not disclosed in the cited references. Thus, the claims are also patentable for additional reasons. However, for economy the additional grounds for patentability are not set forth here.

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned registered practitioner to answer any questions or to discuss steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 17, 2007


John E. Gunther, Reg. No. 43,649

SoCal IP Law Group LLP
310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: 805/230-1350
Facsimile: 805/230-1355
email: info@socalip.com